

PLANNING COMMISSION RECORD

Briefing Session

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, September 14, 2005, 11:00 a.m., Mayor's Conference Room, Second Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jon Carlson, Gene Carroll, Dick Esseks, Gerry Krieser, Roger Larson, Melinda Pearson, Mary Bills-Strand, Lynn Sunderman and Tommy Taylor

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Marvin Krout, Kent Morgan, Steve Henrichsen, Duncan Ross, David Cary and Michele Abendroth (Planning Department); Mike Brienzo, Roger Figard, Randy Hoskins, Brian Kramer, Nick McElvain and Roger Ohlrich (Public Works and Utilities); Brandon Garrett (Engineering Design Consultants); and other interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE Staff briefing on the **Three Future Service Limit Scenarios**

Steve Henrichsen called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.

He began by noting that the intended purpose of the meeting today is to provide information on the three future service limit scenarios and explain the staff recommendation on the scenario. It will be a proposed basis for the public hearing on September 28th.

Henrichsen continued with a PowerPoint presentation. He briefly reviewed the three scenarios. He stated that each of the three scenarios includes 128 square miles inside the future city limits for 2025. There are 82 square miles today. In scenario 1, the future service limit for 2030 remains the same as 2025. Scenario 2 has multi-directional growth and adds approximately 8 square miles for a total of 136 square miles inside the City limits. Scenario 3 has one direction growth to the east and also adds approximately 8 square miles. Both scenario 2 and 3 add approximately six to seven square miles net in terms of land outside of the flood plain.

As we attempt to evaluate each of the scenarios, we must base them on some initial information in terms of infrastructure. Water service basically comes from the Platte River, so growth to the northeast is a little easier. It is also affected by elevation. Some of the areas are at too high of an elevation and would require a booster district. Public Works & Utilities has recommended that the most cost-effective way to add a booster district would be to have a larger area of approximately 2 square miles. There are existing

rural water districts to the east and the southeast which would be impacted in terms of their future growth. If we are going to look at an additional water source, the current well fields will take us through 2035. But it could take 10-20 years to locate an additional source, get a permit and go through the public process.

In terms of wastewater, there are several things underway including Teresa Street and the northeast treatment plant improvement. The Capital Improvement Program has included funds for a future southwest treatment plant and storage facility.

There are several major trunk lines underway that will provide for growth in various directions.

With respect to transportation issues, a significant gap has been identified between road projects and funds to serve the 2025 plan.

Several watershed master plans are underway and some have been completed recently.

Henrichsen then presented the strengths and weaknesses of each of the three scenarios. Scenario 1 strengths include the potential incentive for more efficient use of land; it provides adequate space through 2030 and longer if the land is used more efficiently; concentrates development on new areas to be served; minimizes the need for additional infrastructure beyond current Plan; has the lowest water and sanitary sewer costs of all three scenarios; the vehicle trip length is reduced compared to the other scenarios, because people are closer to their destination; and it supports goals for multi-directional growth. Weaknesses for Scenario 1 include the following: more limited choice of land for development in planning period; in the long term, less land may increase land costs; there is more pressure on higher density residential; and there are fewer locations for new office and industrial parks.

Scenario 2 strengths include more choice of land for development in the planning period; more land may decrease land costs; perhaps less pressure on higher density residential areas in existing neighborhoods; more locations for new office and industrial parks, particularly along highways; supports goals for multi-directional growth; reflects the market reality of interest in development in all areas of Lincoln; more efficient to add a little bit of land in many areas already under development or planned for infrastructure improvements; better use of road capacity in growth along future 6 lane I-80 and 4 lane Highway 34, Highway 77 and South Beltway; distributes traffic better compared to Scenario 3; office and industrial sites have more visibility on existing highways/ I-80 compared to Scenario 3. Weaknesses for Scenario 2 include more infrastructure costs in 25 year period to serve the same population as Scenario 1; highest water and sanitary sewer costs of all three scenarios; it would require additional watershed management studies; increases watershed administration costs due to serving multiple basins rather than one main basin as in Scenario 3; it increases vehicle trip length compared to Scenario 1; and it requires a southwest treatment plant/storage facility.

Strengths for Scenario 3 include more choice of land for development in planning period; perhaps less pressure on higher density residential areas in existing neighborhoods; more

locations for new office and industrial parks; closer to water supply and easier and less costly to serve than Scenario 2; easier and less costly to serve for sanitary sewer than Scenario 2; better use of road capacity in growth along future 6 lane I-80 and 4 lane Highway 34, Highway 77 and South and East Beltway; does not require additional watershed management studies; and since development is in single watershed, there are less watershed administrative costs than Scenario 2. Scenario 3 weaknesses include the following: more infrastructure costs in 25 year period to serve the same population as Scenario 1; it does not reflect market interest in other areas of Lincoln; provides additional land, but all in one basin, which may impact choice and land costs; increases trip length compared to Scenario 1 because people are spread over a larger area; existing roads are mostly dirt or gravel in subareas; there is more pressure on east-west roads in east Lincoln than other scenarios; a small portion next to I-80 may not be able to be served by sanitary sewer; accelerates need for East Beltway, but currently there is limited funding; if East Beltway is not built in time period, there will be little road capacity to serve new growth; if East Beltway is not built, office and industrial sites have less highway visibility and access than Scenario 2.

Carlson asked about the ownership pattern in the future East Beltway area. Henrichsen stated that the area is outside of acreage subdivisions, but they have not checked into the ownership of the land.

Esseks stated that the appeal of Scenario 3 is the proximity to the Omaha metro area and that it enhances our capability to annex Waverly, if it becomes a serious competitor. Esseks then asked if studies have been done along that corridor, in terms of it being popular for development. Henrichsen stated that they have heard comments about sites along the interstate being desirable for development. In terms of residential or industrial development, it isn't likely that the sole criteria would be wanting to be within a certain distance of Omaha. In terms of Waverly, the Comprehensive Plan does not include Waverly as part of the future service limit in the Tier 1, 2 or 3 areas.

Henrichsen then proceeded with the strengths and weaknesses of the subarea plans.

Northwest Subarea strengths include developer interest in the area; potential for office/ industrial locations along Highway 34; utilizes current and future 4 lane capacity on Highway 34; promotes multi-directional growth; and land is outside Airport Noise zones, part in Approach Zone. Weaknesses include that it can only serve 1,500 acres (2.3 square miles), which is not all of land proposed; water service requires booster district; land needing booster is fragmented making a district more costly (cost \$2 to 5 million or more for booster district); at least 2 square miles is needed for cost effectiveness; urban development next to Nine Mile Prairie is a concern; it is not contiguous to urban residential uses; and it will alter Lincoln Public Schools plans.

North Subarea strengths include developer interest in the area; potential for retail, office/ industrial locations along I-80; utilizes 4 lane capacity on Highway 77 and 6 lanes on I-80; and it promotes multi-directional growth. Weaknesses include sanitary sewer service to this land in Little Salt Creek basin is not yet confirmed; timing of Stevens Creek sewer impacts near-term capacity for this area; water service a challenge since most of the land

is above service elevation; not enough land for a booster district, Public Works & Utilities recommends at least 2 square miles for cost effectiveness; potential impact on rare saline wetlands and endangered Salt Creek Tiger Beetle; land west of landfill is not suitable for residential use; and the subarea also has access to gravel at N. 40th and Bluff Road.

Northeast Subarea strengths include developer interest in the area; potential for office/ industrial locations along Cornhusker, I-80 & future East Beltway; utilizes 4 lane capacity on Cornhusker & future East Beltway and 6 lanes on I-80; promotes multi-directional growth; water service relatively easier, but will require distribution mains; capacity in Stevens Creek trunk line; includes existing businesses inside city limits; and it would bring Lincoln next to Waverly city limits. Weaknesses include that it initially impacts N. 84th Street capacity until 98th Street is improved; road network is gravel except for Cornhusker; separated from city by greater than ½ to 1 mile wide floodplain; most of the land is not visible from Cornhusker, I-80 or East Beltway; no timetable for East Beltway; smaller subarea Northeast B may not be able to be served by gravity sewer; and high pressure underground natural gas pipeline traverses the area in two places.

East Subarea strengths include developer interest in area; potential for retail, office/ industrial locations along O Street & future East Beltway; utilizes future 4 lane capacity on East O & Beltway; water service relatively easier – will require distribution mains; capacity in Stevens Creek trunk line; it includes Crooked Creek golf course in city limits; and it utilizes future Stevens Creek trail and greenway. Weaknesses include that it may impact the already congested O Street west of 70th Street in the long term; road network is gravel, some rural pavement except for O Street; and there is no timetable for East Beltway.

Southeast Subarea strengths include the main potential is for residential uses; there is long term retail interest at East Beltway and Pioneers interchange; and capacity in Stevens Creek trunk line. Weaknesses include that it requires sewer and water to be extended through miles over undeveloped Tier I areas; it definitely is not a near term development area; the road network is gravel with some rural pavement; and there is no timetable for East Beltway.

South Subarea strengths include potential developer interest south of future interchange; some potential for office/ industrial or highway retail next to South Beltway; and it utilizes 4 lane future capacity on South Beltway. Weaknesses include there is no capacity in Salt Creek trunk line beyond current Tier I; 410 acres would trigger need for southwest treatment plant/ storage facility; and there is rural paving on S. 54th, gravel on S. 38th; and half of land is more than ½ mile from South Beltway interchange.

West Haines Subarea strengths include the potential for residential uses; landowner and developer interest in area; it would serve State owned land declared surplus; small increments would not trigger need for significant water or roads; it promotes multi-directional growth; it is a logical extension and use of expense for future Haines Branch trunk sewer; it is in close proximity to Pioneers and Wilderness Park and recreational fields. Weaknesses include that the total of 800+ acres would trigger need for southwest treatment plant/ storage facility; it requires sewer and water to be extended through miles

over undeveloped Tier I areas; it is not a near term development area; the road network is gravel and incomplete; and the high pressure underground petroleum pipeline traverses this area from northwest to southeast.

West Middle Subarea strengths include the potential for residential uses; there is developer interest in area; the potential for industrial locations along 6 lane I-80; it promotes multi-directional growth; and it is a logical extension and use of expensive Middle Creek trunk sewer. Weaknesses include water service requires booster district, should have at least 2 square miles for cost effectiveness (will cost \$2 to 5 million or more for booster district); requires sewer & water to be extended through miles over undeveloped Tier I areas; road network is gravel; there is no overpass of I-80 at N. W. 70th, only on N. W. 56th currently; and there is high pressure underground petroleum pipeline traverses this area from north to south.

The group recessed for a short break at 12:02 p.m. reconvening at 12:07 p.m.

Henrichsen presented a memo from Karl Fredrickson and Marvin Krout regarding the recommendation on the future service limit. The top choice of the Planning Department and Public Works & Utilities by unanimous consensus is Scenario 1. It will provide enough growth for the planning period, keep infrastructure costs down and encourage efficient use. They also recommend adding 2.5 square miles of land that is vacant and out of the flood plain. It would include areas in the northwest, the northeast and west and would provide land along the interstate, along Cornhusker Highway, and for additional residential areas. They would also like to designate five areas as large employer opportunity sites.

Henrichsen noted that upcoming meetings include the public hearing on September 28th and the Commons meeting on October 3rd. There is a briefing and an Open House on October 12th and another hearing on October 26th. The November 23rd briefing has been cancelled.

Figard stated that although the Commission members are being pushed hard, they believe it is important to set an aggressive schedule. They can always ask for more time if it is needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Abendroth
Planning Department